

**DCSS P3 PROJECT
TRAINING WORKGROUP
OCTOBER 19, 2000
MEETING SUMMARY**

A. GENERAL

On Thursday, October 19, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Project, Training Workgroup held its seventh official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Doris Keller, State Co-Leader (DCSS Training Unit)
- ☐ Debra Paddack, County Co-Leader (Analyst---Sonoma)
- ☐ Ann Love, State Analyst (DCSS Analyst)
- ☒ Pamela Korman, County Analyst (Manager---San Bernadino)
- ☒ Sharon Quinn, Small County Rep (Senior DDA---Placer)
- ☒ Mary Leibham, Medium County Rep (Manager---Stanislaus)
- ☒ James Martinez, Large County Rep (FSO Supervisor---Fresno)
- ☒ Nora O'Brien, Advocate (Director, ACES)
- ☒ Gloria Clemons-White, DCSS, Training Unit
- ☒ Pat Pianko, Resource (OCSE Rep---Region 9)
- ☒ Michael Wright, Judicial Council Rep (Senior Attorney---AOC)
- ☒ Louise Bayles-Fightmaster, Judicial Council (Sonoma County Specialist)
- ☐ Ed Kent, FTB Rep (Child Support Specialista)
- ☐ Stan Dettner, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☒ Peter Dosh, FTB Rep (Supervisor ---Child Support Collections Program)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☒ Julie Hopkins, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Kathie Lalonde, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Nancy Bienia, Resource (OCSE Rep---DC)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, and decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Julie Hopkins at julie.hopkins@dss.ca.gov.

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

No review of the last meeting's minutes was necessary, as the Workgroup finalized its Short Report and began work on the long (Draft Final) report in that session. Members of the group had received copies of each.

C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

- California Family Support Conference Report/Comments
- Review Intermediate Workgroup Report
- Develop Draft Final Report
- Next Steps
- Cost/Benefit Evaluation
- Forum Questions and Answers

D. CALIFORNIA FAMILY SUPPORT CONFERENCE REPORT/COMMENTS

Julie opened the session with a discussion of the group's presentation at the California Family Support Conference in San Luis Obispo. Both Mary and James did a superb job in presenting the group's recommendations and answering questions raised by the attendees. The presentation was well received.

E. DEVELOP DRAFT FINAL RPEORT

Julie advised the group of the schedule for submission and review of its Draft Final Report:

- 10/19/00 Develop final recommendations
- 10/23/00 Peer Review by Workgroup
- 10/26/00 Final Draft due to Facilitator
- 10/27/00 SRA Review
- 10/30/00 Edit Final Recommendations
- 11/2/00 QA Final
- 11/6/00 Update Final
- 11/8/00 Deliver Final

Peer Reviewers and Volunteers for Follow-on Work

Julie requested volunteers to serve as peer reviewers. These individuals will be responsible for reviewing the Final Draft Report to ensure that it reflects the group's discussions and recommendations. Doris Keller, Mary Leibham, and Michael Wright volunteered. The report will be emailed to all group members on Monday, October 23, and comments will be due by close of business on Thursday, October 26.

There is also a need for some members of the group to serve as Workgroup resources to the DCSS as it implements recommendations. They will answer questions and provide information on topics related to their Workgroups. It is possible that their participation will be needed for as long as two years. Several members of the group volunteered for these roles: Mary Leibham, Doris Keller, Sharon Quinn, Louise Bayles-Fightmaster, James Martinez, and Michael Wright.

Workgroup Edits/Changes

The group reviewed the Intermediate Work Product and compared it with the original draft that had been submitted. They agreed that the intermediate report did reflect the group's recommendations and could be used from that point forward. Some pieces of the report were missing, as follows:

- Executive Summary Doris to complete
- Acknowledgments Mary to complete

Julie will provide samples of the above items to Doris and Mary.

Several members of the group proposed changes to the report, as outlined below.

Process

Page 3, Paragraph 1: The group discussed whether this paragraph might be more appropriate in another section of the report. It was decided to move the first sentence to the Executive Summary. The remainder of the paragraph will be moved to the section of the report in which certification is discussed: Chapter 3, Recommendation 3, on page 12.

Page 6, "Training Needs Assessment" section: This section references a draft training needs assessment tool and makes a reference to the OCSE website, on which another needs assessment tool may be found. The group agreed that the draft needs assessment tool should be included in an appendix. We felt that a simple reference to the OCSE website for their needs assessment tool was sufficient.

In the interest of saving time, the peer reviewers will draft a conclusion paragraph for this section.

Recommendations

Page 7, last paragraph: The group decided to change the wording of the first sentence, to read, "DCSS **must** recognize", rather than "needs to". A comment was received from the DCSS management review, suggesting that the sentence read, "DCSS recognizes . . .". The group discussed this suggestion, but felt that it was necessary to include the word "must" to enforce the mandatory nature of the statement. In the last sentence of the paragraph, the group discussed the need to include improved program performance in this area. Not only does good training lead to fewer complaints, it also leads to better program performance. Everyone agreed that the sentence should be reworded to incorporate both program performance and the delivery of high-quality child support services, leading to greater customer satisfaction.

Page 9, Best Practices: The first bullet in this section makes a reference to the CFSC Strategic Training Plan; it was agreed that this plan should be included as an appendix in the report.

A conclusion this chapter was discussed; the peer reviewers will develop it.

Next Steps

The group reviewed this section of the report, and noted that the first and last steps must be changed to agree with the changes made today. A global search and replace is needed to replace “task force” with “advisory committee”.

Page 19: Delete the sentence beginning, "This exercise will be".

Last paragraph, last sentence: Start sentence with: “It is more cost effective to.....” instead of “It is imperative ...”

This chapter was also in need of a conclusion paragraph; the peer reviewers will develop it.

DCSS Comments/Review

During their review of the report, the group discussed the comments that the DCSS Management Team had made on the Intermediate Work Product. The group agreed with most of these minor comments, excepted where noted in these minutes.

F. COST/BENEFIT EVALUATION

The group reviewed its recommendations, and attached a cost and benefit evaluation to each. This information will be incorporated into the Draft Final Report.

Recommendation	Cost	Benefit
Training Strategic Plan	\$	☺☺☺
Advisory Committee	\$	☺☺☺
Training Needs Assessment	\$\$	☺☺☺(
Uniform Statewide Training Curricula	\$\$\$+	☺☺☺☺(
FSO/Trainer Certification	\$\$\$	☺☺(
Training Resource/Materials Inventory	\$\$	☺☺☺
Training Repository	\$\$ Est \$ M	☺☺☺(
Modify existing/Develop New training materials	\$\$\$+	☺☺☺☺(
External Stakeholder Training	\$\$\$	☺☺
— Develop & provide informational materials		
— Cooperative agreements		

G. FORUM QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

We did not have sufficient time to address these. Gloria agreed to make an effort to draft responses, to be shared with the peer reviewers.

H. CROSS-WORKGROUP ISSUES

None identified.

I. SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

None identified.

J. HANDOUTS

- Draft Final Workgroup Report
- Intermediate Work Product

K. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES

None.

L. ATTACHMENTS

Action Item List.